

REMARKS

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The Final Office Action dated May 29, 2008 has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

In this Office Action, claims 11, 12, 14-21, 23, 24 and 41 are examined. Claims 11, 12, 14-21, 23 and 24 are rejected and claim 41 is allowed. In this reply, claims 11, 12, 15, 16, 23, 24, and 41 are amended and claim 14 is canceled. No new matter has been added. Therefore, claims 11, 12, 15-21, 23, 24 and 41 are currently pending. Claims 11 and 41 are independent claims. The Applicants respectfully submit that the application is in condition for allowance.

In this Office Action, claims 11, 12, 14-21, 23 and 24 are rejected under 35 USC 112. Claims 11, 12 and 14 are not indicated as allowed over the prior art of record because the intended scope of these claims are unclear for the reasons mentioned in the above rejection under 35 USC 112. The same reasons are also applied to claims 15-21, 23 and 24 because they depend on claims 11 and 14.

Claim 41 is allowed over the prior art of record because none of the prior art discloses or suggests a LCD device comprising a second polarizing plate above a backlight unit, the second polarizing plate including a passivation layer and a light diffusion layer, a thin layer being the only layer disposed between the passivation layer and the light diffusion layer, and the thin layer being thinner than the passivation.

To overcome the pending rejections, claim 11 has been amended to recite "the second polarizing plate comprising a first adhesive layer, a first passivation layer, a polarizer, a second passivation layer, a second adhesive layer, a $\lambda/4$ phase shift plate, a third adhesive layer, a cholesteric Liquid Crystal (CLC) layer, a third passivation layer, and a light-diffusion layer having a plurality of projection on a surface thereof". Further, claim 11 has been changed to recite "wherein the light-diffusion layer directly contacts the third passivation layer, wherein the light-diffusion layer produces an amount of Haze, and a density of the projections of the light-diffusion layer is less than a density of beads that would have to be added to the third adhesive layer to obtain the same amount of Haze".

In view of the amendments to claim 11, claim 14 has been cancelled and claim 12 has been amended to delete redundant language. Further, their recited claims have been amended in claims 15, 16, 23 and 24.

Amended claim 11 recites the feature of original claim 26, "the light-diffusion layer directly contacts the third passivation layer, wherein the light-diffusion layer produces an amount of Haze, and a density of the projections of the light-diffusion layer is less than a density of beads that would have to be added to the third adhesive layer to obtain the same amount of Haze" and the claimed invention includes the feature allowed in the Office Action dated November 16, 2007.

Therefore, the cited references, ARA (Amditted Related Art), Kameyama (US 6339501) and Unemoto (US 6542300), singly or in combination, do not teach or suggest the above features of amended claim 11.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 11 and claims 12, 15-21, 23 and 24, which depend therefrom, are allowable over the cited references.

Further, as suggested, claim 41 has been amended to insert "the" before "passivation" in line 7.

Conclusion

Based on the above amendments and remarks, the Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance. The Examiner is kindly invited to contact the undersigned attorney to expedite allowance.

Dated: August 21, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

/Gustavo Siller, Jr./

Gustavo Siller, Jr., Reg. No. 32,305
Attorney for Applicants

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
PO BOX 10395
CHICAGO, IL 60610
(312) 321-4200